

١٠٠

MEDICAL EDUCATION IN ONTARIO.

A Letter to the Hon. Oliver Mowat, LL.D., M.P.P., Attorney-General of Ontario, in reply to a Letter by Sir Daniel Wilson, LL.D., F.R.S.E., Etc., to the Hon. the Minister of Education.

TO THE HON. OLIVER MOWAT, LL.D., M.P.P.,
Attorney General of Ontario, etc., etc.

DEAR SIR,—A printed copy of a letter dated Feb. 22nd, 1892, by Sir Daniel Wilson, President of University College, addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Education, in reply to a communication sent by me to you, dated Nov. 3rd, 1891, on the subject of Medical Education in Ontario, has just been sent to me. The learned writer not only challenges, but entirely misconstrues and sometimes totally misrepresents, perhaps not altogether wilfully, some of the statements in the letter to which he replies. It is, therefore, necessary for me to trouble you once more, in order to prove the substantial correctness of the position taken by me throughout this entire discussion, and to correct the misconstructions and misrepresentations referred to, so that the Government may the sooner be able to reach such a solution of existing difficulties, as will be considered satisfactory and fair to all concerned.

I shall not follow the learned President's example in using strong language of denunciation or depreciation—nor shall I seek to slur the character of anyone, whether long since dead, or still living. The position taken by those for whom I speak, is far too strong to require the adoption of tactics so questionable.

I am greatly surprised that Sir Daniel Wilson, a gentleman occupying a position so distinguished, and who, if spared, as I trust he may be, will soon reach the four score limit of human life, should have seen fit to adopt the very opposite course.

I.—The Abolition of the Former University Medical Faculty in 1853.

The abolition of the former Medical Faculty of the University in 1853 is the matter first alluded to by Sir Daniel. Up to 1853, this Faculty, main-

1892
tained at the public expense, and the only Medical Faculty in the Province so maintained, was abolished by the old Parliament of Canada, only two of the members voting for its retention.

It would be very difficult to find a case of any legislature coming to a more unanimous decision on an educational question. It is easy, however, to explain this, all but unanimity of action, in view of the sound principle which was then very generally held, and which commends itself now, to most people of ordinary common sense, "That it is not the duty of the State to use public funds of any kind, in educating students for a special profession, such as medicine or law, any more than for any other calling by which people earn their living." The government organ at the time in Toronto, "The Leader" of Nov. 22nd, 1852, in an editorial on "Medical Education," clearly explains the view which then prevailed. "When we take our stand on an impregnable principle of political economy, and assert that the State is not justified in employing public moneys to produce an article which experience has shown that private enterprise is abundantly able to supply, no one is bold enough to controvert this principle." Also from the same paper of Oct. 26th, 1852, "There are three medical schools in Toronto. Why continue to sustain one by public money, when the facts show that the article you want is supplied by private enterprise?" The learned President, however, with characteristic simplicity and self-confidence, says that he has "No doubt that the abolition of the Medical Faculty was largely due to the antagonism between the late Dr. Rolph and certain professional rivals; the Hon. Dr. Rolph being at the time of its abolition, a member of the Government." That a Canadian legislature, sitting in Quebec, and composed of members coming from every part of both the old Provinces of Canada, could be influenced in any appreciable degree by

"antagonism" between Dr. Rolph and certain rival doctors in Toronto, of which alleged "antagonism," the members, with hardly an exception, must have been entirely ignorant, is a suggestion in the last degree absurd. If all Sir Daniel's views on questions pertaining to medical education, rest on foundations as flimsy as this, they can hardly be deemed worthy of much attention. Having been in 1852 engaged in medical practice not far from Toronto, and quite familiar with all the circumstances, I can testify that the decision reached by the Legislature was the result of the sound common sense policy laid down and acted upon in regard to educating men for lucrative professions, with the cost of which, the members held, *the country should have nothing whatever to do*, and to-day, public opinion is on the side of this principle as in 1853.

II.—A Slur cast by Sir Daniel on the Late Hon. Dr. Rolph, who died in 1870.

Sir Daniel Wilson, somewhat obscurely however, makes a further allusion to the late Hon. Dr. Rolph, which as a matter of good taste would have been much better omitted. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is a familiar adage, which is happily very seldom forgotten.

The allusion is in connection with hints alleged to have been thrown out by him, regarding the re-establishment of the Medical Department of Toronto University not long after its abolition.

Dr. Rolph was a man eminent in many ways, and with reference to this allusion, I have pleasure in doing an act of simple justice to his memory. As one of Dr. Rolph's intimate friends, and his colleague in the Medical Department of Victoria College from 1855 to 1870, when he retired from active work, I never heard him say a word on the subject Sir Daniel refers to. During all those years, probably no one knew him better, or saw more of him than the writer, and he took the greatest interest, and talked freely with his friends on every matter connected with medical education. Had this subject been on his mind, he certainly would have mentioned it. As Dean of the *entirely self-sustaining* Medical Department of Victoria College, which he so ably conducted for many years, Dr. Rolph was satisfied and happy, and greatly beloved by all the students. The medical men he educated, are scattered all over

Canada, and not a few of them have been, and others are now, worthy members of our several Canadian Legislatures, and, with hardly an exception, they cherish and revere his memory.

III.—The Advance of General Scientific Knowledge, good ground for satisfaction.

Everybody unites with the learned President in rejoicing at the advances made in all branches of science. It is most desirable to have every department of science necessary to a thorough *general* education, not only taught, but well taught, in the Provincial University which exists for the very purpose of affording the highest *general* culture to our youth who fill her halls, so that they may be ornaments to any profession or calling they may subsequently follow. We are proud too, of our Agricultural Colleges, as indispensable to a farming province like Ontario. For the more scientific the farming, the better for every man in the Province. No one grudges the support given to our normal and other schools—to the schools of pedagogy, and of practical science and engineering, so as to provide us with well educated teachers, surveyors, civil engineers, analysts, and with people skilled in any other departments of science which the country may require, for the development of its natural resources, and which unaided private enterprise could not adequately, or perhaps at all supply, as we have not now, and hitherto we never have had, any such schools or colleges established in Ontario by private enterprise. For such necessary purposes which the country's actual needs call for, by all means let public aid be given always wisely, yet in no stinted way. Up to this point but not beyond it, the writer agrees with the learned President.

IV.—No Medical Education at the Public Expense.

The people of Ontario are in their own opinion quite sufficiently taxed now. In not a few cases hard working farmers and others find it just hard enough to make a fair living for themselves and their families. The province with praise-worthy liberality places a thoroughly good *general* education within the reach of every young person who cares to have it. This can be carried even to graduation in Arts or Science in our Provincial

University, and in addition private munificence has stepped in, for recently the Hon. Chancellor Blake gave the princely gift of \$20,000 to aid Arts students, who are beginning their studies, by providing scholarships at matriculation. But to give learned and lucrative professions, wholly or even partially at the public cost, is quite another thing. There is no such special lack of doctors as to call for or justify our increasing their numbers at the public expense. The profession of medicine indeed is now so well filled, that many of those educated in all our Medical Colleges go to the United States and to other countries for a living. Are our farmers and all other people in Ontario willing—or is it right that they *should* be taxed to educate doctors to supply other countries than their own? It is hoped that enough has been adduced on this point to show the unreasonableness, and manifest injustice as far as the public is concerned, of continuing to subsidize medical education in the Provincial University. It clearly appears from his letter, however, that the learned President is prepared to go *any* length in endeavoring as far as possible not only to continue, but to extend the evil we complain of. Under all the circumstances of the case, it will we think be admitted that sufficient reasons have been given in this letter to justify us in the most strenuous and increasing opposition to an unfair use of public funds, which should never have been allowed to have a beginning, for we again assert, that this subsidizing of one Medical Faculty, is a threefold injustice—*unjust to the public, to the Arts Department of the University, and last, but by no means least, to the self-supporting Medical Colleges*, for which, as having chartered them, government is bound we respectfully submit, to secure absolute fair play, which is all they ask for. Can there be a more reasonable request? Ontario has shown by forty years of experience that Medical Colleges can be most efficiently conducted on the entirely self-sustaining principle—providing buildings and everything else they require, out of the fees of the students they teach. Should any colleges happen to secure private endowments, this is a matter with which no one has any concern. But as a rule, those which are entirely unendowed, are said to do better work than others, for as their success depends entirely on the ability, zeal and assiduity of their professors and lecturers, these feel neces-

sitated to put forth all the energy they possess, and therefore are believed to do better teaching. It was forty years ago proved, and it is no less decisively proved to-day, that the *quality* of the professional men educated by a Medical Faculty, maintained in part at the public expense, is not a whit better, nor do they take any higher standing than others do, towards whose education not one fraction of *public* money has been contributed. To-day, and for many years past, the standing of the candidates from the various Medical Colleges, at the examinations of the several examining boards in Great Britain, and at the examinations of our own Medical Council, which all who intend residing in Ontario have to take, proclaims this with trumpet tongue over the whole land. There can be no better evidence than this, of the extreme unwisdom, as well as the gross injustice of subsidizing as is now done, *one* out of the *six* Medical Teaching Faculties, which, including the colleges for women, exist in Ontario. Our people are sensible and shrewd and quite able to form their own judgment in regard to such matters, and if the future is to be judged of by the past, the injustice complained of will not be allowed to continue long.

V.—The President's Garbling.

Sir Daniel refers with much warmth, and in strong language to my reference to the Legislative grant of \$160,000 given to the University after the fire. He speaks of my "making to the Attorney General, a charge against the authorities of the University (page 4 and page 6), of my letter having been forwarded to him by the Hon., the Minister of Education," with the request for a reply to its grave charges, including that of fraudulent misappropriation of public fund obtained on false pretences." I never made any such charge, and never used, or wrote any such words as are here attributed to me. Had Sir Daniel been a younger man, I would with utmost indignation have thrown back these words upon him. I content myself with entirely repudiating the idea he disingenuously seeks to convey to those who only see the few extracts he has garbled from my letter, with which even he appears to have deceived himself. Such a thought as the "fraudulent misappropriation of public funds obtained on false pretences" on the part of the "authorities of the University"

never once entered my mind, nor has any one of the many who have spoken to me on the subject ever hinted at such an inference as that which Sir Daniel has drawn from my letter. I greatly respect the Senate and the Professors of Toronto University, and would as soon think of charging the Premier of Great Britain with till-tapping as of doing what Sir Daniel Wilson's letter indicates. What I meant was this—and a careful reading of Sir Daniel's many admissions in his letter, and a knowledge of much to which he either does not refer at all, or passes over very lightly, has only intensified my conviction of its truth—that the legislature of Ontario which voted the \$160,000 referred to, had not the remotest idea, any more than the members of the *Government themselves*, that a very large sum, equivalent to a considerable and possibly the greater proportion of the amount granted, would be spent in erecting buildings largely for medical teaching purposes, and it appears to me incredible, that it should be so spent in this way which, it is admitted, neither the Legislature nor the Government for one moment either intended or anticipated. I refer of course to the large expenditure for dissecting-rooms, vat-rooms, etc., for the study of human anatomy, and for other class rooms used for medical education in *this one college*, while all other Medical Colleges in the Province provide everything of this kind wholly at their own expense. And I have reason to know, that an influential section of the University Senate takes the same view of this matter. I know also, that however large the amount which has been spent in what I regard as the unjust, and unwise way objected to, and which was all public money quite as much as the grant—even if it had exceeded the amount of the grant, it would have been raised some how or other, and the entire \$160,000 that is the whole grant, as a matter of course, applied to the special purpose for which it was voted. Everybody at all acquainted with the financial affairs of Toronto University at the present time is aware, that the amount of money already spent on these buildings, has seriously crippled the University, and prevents the possibility of some departments, however urgent their needs, having their due share of money spent upon them. From Sir Daniel Wilson's letter it might be gathered, that the Medical and Biological Departments constitute almost the entire University.

This is, however, by no means the case. Yet from the lavish way in which money has been spent on these, and the warm justification of this expenditure by the learned President, and his proved willingness to increase it, one cannot help thinking that he considers it the right thing to do, although the inevitable result of this policy is to leave some important departments largely unaided to struggle along as best they can. Is this policy not likely in the near future to prove injurious to the best interests, and usefulness of the University?

VI.—Sir Daniel Wilson on the Biological Buildings and the Uses to which they are Applied.

The President seeks to throw doubts on my statements as to the Biological Buildings being used to any great extent, or having been intended largely for medical teaching purposes. He seeks to befog his readers by quoting the number of square feet contained in the buildings, etc. This the President parades as "facts," but they have very little bearing indeed on *facts* of another kind taken from the official calendar of the University of Toronto Medical Faculty, for 1890-91, in which there is a full page-sized cut, of the main part of the Biological Building (facing page 28), while on page 27 is the following: "The teaching in this department will follow closely the requirements of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and will, in addition, comply with the regulations of the University of Toronto" (that is, in medicine).

"University of Toronto Medical Faculty.

"The fourth session since the re-establishment of the Medical Faculty of the University will commence on Wednesday, Oct. 1st, 1890, when the opening lecture will be delivered in the *Biological laboratory* (page 19)." On this occasion, Oct. 1st, 1890, Sir Daniel Wilson, LL.D., etc., is reported in the *Toronto World* of Oct. 2nd, 1890, to have said that "Toronto University had spent some \$130,000 on these magnificent buildings to give medical students the best equipped school in Europe or America." Why did the President not refer to this speech in his letter? He should have quoted it.

The official calendar of the University Medical Faculty for 1891-2, has the following paragraph:

"UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MEDICAL FACULTY.—

"The fifth session since the re-establishment of the Medical Faculty of the University of Toronto will commence on Thursday, Oct. 1st, 1891, when the opening lecture will be delivered in the *Biological laboratory*."

"The lectures and demonstrations in the subjects of the first and second years will be given in the *Biological laboratory* and in the *lecture rooms of the University*."

This last paragraph means that *two* sessions of medical teaching work out of the *four* required—that is exactly one-half of the *medical course*—is done in buildings erected at the public cost. After trying, notwithstanding his full knowledge of this being the case, to show how little the new buildings are used for medical teaching, and saying, although they contain dissecting-rooms, bone-rooms, vat-rooms, etc., that they would have been built all the same had no Medical Faculty existed, he virtually admits that his contention is incorrect, because compelled to do so, for on page 6 he says, "And in so far as certain portions of the building are set apart for the Medical Faculty, a report was obtained from the architect specifying their estimated cost, and on the basis thus furnished an annual rent of \$1,200 is charged to the Medical Faculty, in accordance with the report of a joint committee of the Board of Trustees and the Senate, as what, in their estimation, 'would be a just and adequate allowance' as interest at four per cent. on the cost of erection." (See recent Finance Report of University Committee.) It is said that this decision to charge rent was only recently reached, and was not contemplated by the promoters of the medical part of the building. This \$1,200 looks well and fair on paper, but in reality it is not in any sense an adequate return for the great cost, as well as the deterioration in the value of the property. To understand this last point clearly, it has to be borne in mind that dissecting-rooms, vat-rooms and others, where human anatomy is studied and taught for at least six months of each year, now form part of this fine pile of buildings. The parts of the building actually used for this work, must necessarily have a very strong and—even to many medical men and students—a most unpleasant smell. This is so all-pervading that it creates a dissecting-room atmosphere far and near, so as to make even a large building,

more or less unpleasant from the basement to the roof. This smell it is impossible entirely to get rid of. With care, it may be lessened in some degree, yet, do what you will, the air in adjoining apartments will often be found so unpleasantly tainted as to be positively sickening to a great many persons. I have already heard of a good many complaints by University Arts students on this very ground, some saying to me that "the smell was simply abominable." Indeed, so long as dissecting is carried on at all, or bodies kept in vat-rooms in any building, this hateful odor will inevitably continue. It is said that the plans for the dissecting and vat-rooms, and the rest of the "Medical Faculty" portion of the building, was never submitted to the Senate. Is this the fact or not? Sir Daniel Wilson tries to show how little room the medical students occupy in the Biological department, but everyone says there are a great many more of them (said to be fully two to one—see University Class List for 1891) than there are of Arts students, who are taking the science course. I can venture the opinion quite safely that, let dissecting go on, and the regular courses on anatomy continue to be given in the building as at the present time, and before long, no one will be found willing to occupy, either as a teacher or student, any of the lecture or other rooms near enough the anatomical region to be more or less smell-stricken, unless those who are either teaching or studying human anatomy. It will soon all be left for the medicals. How far will the \$1,200, to be charged for rent, go, in meeting the interest on the cost of those extensive portions of the building thus rendered comparatively useless? Twice \$1,200 would not do it. Besides this, is it fair to have any Arts professors, or Arts students, male or female, subjected to this unbearable unpleasantness? Under existing circumstances, non-medical students—even ladies—have, against their wish, seen what they would gladly have avoided seeing, and some have suffered more or less from contaminated air, who did not expect this sort of thing when they entered on their studies. Having been a medical teacher nearly all my life, I speak from experience. In Trinity Medical College we suffered much some years ago from the air of our entire building being more or less tainted in this way, no matter what might be done to prevent it. For the sake of

professors and students alike, the Faculty, as soon as possible, but *entirely at their own cost*, erected the admirable building now in use for anatomical work, which is completely isolated, and ever since we have had no discomfort. But there is another pertinent question: With the regular increase in her own Arts classes, and the advent of the Victoria Arts students in the coming fall, will every nook of space in the entire building, available for teaching, not be required for purely Arts and general science purposes?

VII.—Sir Daniel Wilson Approves of all the Outlay so far, of Public Funds on Medical Education, and is Anxious to go even further.

Sir Daniel Wilson thinks it quite right that the State should pay a large share of the cost of medical education, including building dissecting-rooms, etc. Not long since he was a member of a committee of the Senate, indeed, he seconded the motion defining its duties, viz., "To urge upon the Government the propriety of constituting Anatomy, Pathology and Sanitary Science a part of the work of the University, and to assist the University in providing the requisite means." This resolution appeared in the *Globe* of May 11th, 1891. It simply meant, in addition to all the already great outlay on buildings, the establishing of three State-paid professorships in medicine. The project was vigorously protested against at once, and, fortunately, came to nothing, and the committee was discharged. The Hon. the Chancellor, and other influential members of the Senate were known entirely to disapprove of it; yet, as an illustration of the pertinacity with which the idea of getting all that can be got from the public purse is clung to, certain speakers of the same way of thinking as Sir Daniel, at a University public gathering not very long since, referred to further action in this matter as being "merely postponed" on account of the losses caused by the late fire, thus foreshadowing their intention in due time of pressing this preposterous claim on the Government.

VIII.—Fees Earned by University-paid Arts Teachers, should be used entirely for Arts support.

In my letter, certain fees paid by the medical students in the first and second years, were spoken

of. Sir Daniel thus refers to this point: "Under a University Statute confirmed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, all fees paid by medical students are apportioned to the Medical Faculty." In the interpretation of this statute, fees paid by students for Physiology, Chemistry and Biology, have been so apportioned. Here I would very specially ask—Under whose "interpretation" of the statute was this done—that of the Attorney-General, or the Minister of Education, or the Chancellor of the University? The aggregate amount of the fees thus earned entirely by professors and teachers, paid by the University, or from other public funds, (a small portion of it being earned in the School of Practical Science), is no trifling sum, being \$34 from every first year's student, and \$37 for every student in the second year. Allowing sixty students in each of these years, the total amount would be \$4,260.

According to ordinary business principles, this money should go, without any deduction, towards the payment of the salaries of the teachers who give the instruction.

This would make just so much more public money available, for the many purposes where it is so much needed, especially in the Arts Department of the University. Sir Daniel Wilson, himself, however, after making certain deductions from these fees, for one purpose or another, admits that those for Chemistry (general), and Physiology, do go into the medical fund—this amounts to \$24 per student in the first and second years respectively—sixty students in each year will give $120 \times 24 = \$2,880$. This sum is earned wholly by University-paid Arts Professors, and clearly therefore, belongs to the Arts Department. It would go a long way towards paying the small salaries given to assistant teachers in many of the Arts Departments where extra teaching is much needed, but cannot be had, to the extent required by the students, from want of funds. In the self-sustaining colleges, all the teaching is done in every subject by the Professors, who are paid out of the fees they earn—and all expenses are also paid out of these fees. Sir Daniel himself admits that some "readjustment of some of the arrangements heretofore adopted in reference to the special medical fund, may commend itself to your judgment under present circumstances, is possible."

IX.—Important Points left Un-noticed— Irrelevant Matters Dragged in.

Sir Daniel passes over without the slightest notice, the self-evident injustice of subsidizing one Medical College at the public expense, and tacking it on to the Provincial University as its Medical Faculty, thus bringing it into unfair competition with the other five which are altogether self-sustaining. Nor does Sir Daniel allude to the fact stated in my letter, that the work done in the latter institutions has been proved year after year for many years, before competent Medical Boards at home and abroad, to be as good as any done in Canada. This is absolutely undeniable. The restoration of a Medical Faculty to the Provincial University has been proved once more, to be a very great, and quite an unnecessary expense to the University and the country. One disastrous result has been, to de-provincialize the University in Medicine, making her, not a friendly co-worker with all our Medical Colleges, as from her provincial character she should be, but bringing her down to the undignified and unprovincial position of being a keen and a most unfair, because a subsidized competitor, with every one of them, for each student—and this, notwithstanding the fact, that some of these Colleges, our own for example, have been for many years affiliated with her, under their respective charters. The President sees fit to drag Medical Council matters too, into his letter. What have these to do with the question of the unfair public subsidizing of medical education in one college out of six? The gentlemen to whom the speaker in the Medical Council refers, quoted by Sir Daniel, are amongst the best friends of that body, and are excellent judges as to what is its wisest and best policy. All they desired was, to have time given for the careful consideration of every step, when great changes were being made, so as to avoid the taking of even one false step, which might create trouble and possibly have to be retraced. The President also refers to Trinity Medical College having been asked five years ago to join in the formation of the restored Medical Faculty. There is no use bringing this question up now, as at present, it has no bearing whatever on the matter in hand. One objection to her doing so, which is unanswerable, is stated in my letter, that "Medical Colleges large enough to require

the services of a complete staff of professors and other teachers, can no more be rolled together than can large congregations, or public schools." Besides this, Sir Daniel knows very well, that the scheme submitted in 1887 to Trinity Medical College, and the agreement made subsequently by the University, with the Toronto School of Medicine, were very materially different. The learned President too, thinks it a good plan as in Edinburgh, to have many hundreds of students attend the same classes. This necessitates the employment of a perfect army of grinders, causing a large additional expenditure to every student. Besides, professors who can keep up the attention and profitably teach classes of several hundreds are few and far between, either in Canada or elsewhere. As a practical medical teacher, I much prefer the London plan, of having self-supporting Medical schools, with large, yet not too large classes, as better both for professors and students. Once more, I am surprised that the President should have stooped to refer to a matter long since fully answered, but to which he calls even special attention. This is the closing paragraph of an old letter of mine, dated March, 1887, the President should have said, but he did not do so: that this entire letter was written for the very purpose of showing how "unwise" and "undesirable" it would be, to restore a Medical Faculty to Toronto University, that to do so would reduce the University so far as Medicine was concerned, from her Provincial position as a centre, round which all the Medical Colleges might cluster, each sending up a quota of its students to graduate every year, to that of a mere local College competing keenly for students. In the light of to-day, does this not seem somewhat prophetic? The only part of this letter Sir Daniel quotes, is the very end "I think it will be ample time to give the subject full consideration, when we learn that the Government of Ontario, with the cordial support of our Provincial Legislature, has fully decided to create, equip and endow liberally, a new Medical Teaching Body; and to provide for it a staff of the best teachers the country can furnish; each of whom shall have a salary secured to him of not less than \$2,000 a year, for each of the principal chairs; and a suitable retiring allowance, when, from age or ill-health, he is no longer able to discharge his duties. Till this is done the project is a mere "castle in the air."

This letter ended as it did, only because on indubitable authority I was informed, and then believed, that the "conditions" pre-supposed by me, of "endowing and equipping," the giving of salaries and retiring allowance, etc., were just as likely to occur, as would be the appointment of Sir Daniel Wilson, as Admiral in Chief of Her Majesty's Navy, or the extension of the Toronto Street Railway to the moon, and no more so. The old letter is filled with all sorts of reasons showing that matters had much better be left as they were, and that the proposed scheme would be very unlikely to work well, and that the carrying of it out, bristled with many real and most practical difficulties. Has this not proved to be the case?

In answering my letter, Sir Daniel has left entirely out of sight its principal feature, viz., the huge injustice and impolicy of subsidizing with public funds, *one* and *only one* of our six medical colleges. Yet this is one of the main points of the whole discussion—not only so—but he defends all the outlay of public funds connected with this injustice, and has shown himself ready, and even anxious to increase it, and he never so much as mentions the crippling effect of the recent unprecedented expenditure, on the other departments of the University.

In the absence of sound, and often of any arguments against my contention, he has resorted to all sorts of detraction, and has, as I have already said, put into my letter as used by me, against the authorities of the University, words I never wrote or spoke, and thoughts that never once entered into my mind; whether the words I allude to are Sir Daniel's own, or merely quoted from an official letter addressed to him, and endorsed by him, or not, I do not know, but in either case they are, to use the mildest word possible, entirely and most mischievously incorrect, and misrepresenting. He has dragged all sorts of subjects into this discussion, which have nothing more to do with it than the fixed stars.

In this reply, much longer than I could have wished, I have striven to confine myself closely to the subject under consideration. I close by sincerely hoping that very soon a settlement of this question *just* to all concerned, may be reached by the Government.

I have the honor to be,

Yours with the greatest respect,

WALTER B. GEIKIE,

Dean Trinity Medical College.

HOLYROOD VILLA, MAITLAND ST.,

TORONTO, March 10th, 1892.

